

### **REMARKS**

Claims 51, 54, 81 and 82 are presently under consideration in the application. Claim 51 has been amended herein. Favorable reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

#### ***I. REJECTION OF CLAIM 51 UNDER 35 USC §103(a)***

Claim 51 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) based on *Maeda et al.* in view of *Hasegawa et al.* and *Eichenlaub*. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection for at least the following reasons.

Applicants have amended claim 51 to recite, *inter alia*, how the rear substrate is provided with the partially reflective mirror. Support for such amendment can be found, for example, at page 8, line 20 and page 14, line 28 of the present application.

Claim 51, as amended, clarifies the positional relationship of the partially reflective mirror and the rear substrate previously recited in claim 51. Specifically, the rear substrate is provided with the partially reflective mirror.

In rejecting claim 51, the Examiner relies on Fig. 22 of *Maeda et al.* as teaching liquid crystal inherently disposed between a “front substrate” and a “rear substrate” as recited in claim 51. In addition, the Examiner refers to a reflecting plate 220 in Fig. 22 of *Maeda et al.* as corresponding to the “partially reflective mirror” recited in claim 51.

Fig. 22 of *Maeda et al.*, however, does not teach or suggest that “the rear substrate is provided with the partially reflective mirror” as recited in amended claim 51. As is illustrated in Fig. 22 of *Maeda et al.*, a liquid crystal panel 10 is provided. Fig. 23 illustrates in more detail how the liquid crystal panel 10 includes liquid crystal 13 between glass plates 11 and 12. Thus, applicants agree with the Examiner that *Maeda et al.* teaches liquid crystal 13 disposed between a front substrate 11 and a rear substrate 12.

On the other hand, *Maeda et al.* teaches that reflecting plate 220 is provided separate and apart from the rear substrate 12. Thus, it cannot be said that *Maeda et al.* teaches or suggests that the rear substrate is provided with the partially reflective mirror as recited in amended claim 51.

For at least the above reasons, applicants respectfully submit that *Maeda et al.*, whether taken alone or in combination with *Hasegawa et al.* and *Eichenlaub*, does not teach or suggest a transfective display as recited in amended claim 51. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

## **II. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 54 AND 81-82 UNDER 35 USC §103(a)**

Claims 54 and 81-82 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) based on *Maeda et al.* in view of *Hasegawa et al.* and *Eichenlaub*, and further in view of *Handschy*. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claims 54 and 81-82 each depend from claim 51, either directly or indirectly, and therefore may be distinguished over the teachings of *Maeda et al.* in view of *Hasegawa et al.* and *Eichenlaub* for at least the same reasons discussed above. Furthermore, *Handschy* does not make up for the above-discussed deficiencies in the primary, secondary and tertiary references.

Consequently, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

## **III. CONCLUSION**

Accordingly, all claims 51, 54 and 81-82 are believed to be allowable and the application is believed to be in condition for allowance. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

Serial No.: 09/787,594

Should the Examiner feel that a telephone interview would be helpful to facilitate favorable prosecution of the above-identified application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below.

Should a petition for an extension of time be necessary for the timely reply to the outstanding Office Action (or if such a petition has been made and an additional extension is necessary), petition is hereby made and the Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees (including additional claim fees) to Deposit Account No. 18-0988.

Respectfully submitted,

RENNER, OTTO, BOISSELLE & SKLAR, LLP

/Mark D. Saralino/  
Mark D. Saralino  
Reg. No. 34,243

DATE: October 24, 2006

The Keith Building  
1621 Euclid Avenue  
Nineteenth Floor  
Cleveland, Ohio 44115  
(216) 621-1113

B:\GEN\YAMA\Yamap757\yamap757amendmentnonfinal3.wpd